

IRISH  
University Education.

---

A SPEECH

DELIVERED IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS, IN MOVING THE SECOND READING OF  
A BILL TO MAKE PROVISION FOR UNIVERSITY  
EDUCATION IN IRELAND,

JULY 26<sup>TH</sup> 1877.

BY

ISAAC BUTT,  
MEMBER FOR THE CITY OF LIMERICK.

---

"It is not less impolitic than it is unjust, to interfere by a great phalanx of English votes to prevent a concession to Ireland, in a matter in which that country is entitled to expect that its wishes should have effect given to them."

MR. GLADSTONE, February, 1875.

---

DUBLIN:  
M. H. GILL & SON,  
50, UPPER SACKVILLE STREET

---

1877.

LIBRARY  
OF THE  
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

DUBLIN :

PRINTED BY W. J. ALLEY AND CO., RYDER'S ROW, CAPEL STREET.

21 Jan. '29 - CL.

378,415

B981

## INTRODUCTION.

---

IN offering to the public in its present form this reprint of an effort to direct the attention of the House of Commons to the grievance and injustice under which Ireland suffers from our present system of university, it may be useful that I should preface it by a few words upon the effect of the discussion and division on the great question of which these pages record a very imperfect advocacy.

With the history of "The Bill to make better Provision for University Education in Ireland" it is not necessary to trouble the reader. On the 26th of July last I moved the second reading of that Bill. After a debate which occupied the entire evening, Mr. Plunket's motion to postpone the Bill for six months was carried, after midnight, by a majority, including tellers on both sides, of 202 to 57.

Only three English members voted for the second reading of the Bill, and of these, one, Major Beaumont, is said to have voted by mistake. If this be so, only two English members, Mr. Christopher Rice Talbot, the member for Glamorganshire, and Mr. John Locke, the member for Southwark, recorded their votes in favour of the principle of an act of plain and clear justice to this country.

The speech reprinted in these pages was made in introducing the second reading of the Bill. I spoke a second time at the close of the debate, in reply to the Chief Secretary for Ireland. Concluding after midnight I had the disadvantage of not being reported.\* In addition to myself the speakers for the Bill were The

\* The fullest account that I can find in any Irish paper is the record that "Mr. Butt replied to the Chief Secretary at considerable length."

O'Donoghue, Captain Nolan, Mr. Errington, Mr. Arthur Moore, Major O'Reilly, Lord Robert Montagu, The O'Connor Don, and Mr. Cogan. Against the Bill the speakers were Mr. David Plunket, who moved, and Mr. Macartney, who seconded, its rejection; Mr. Lowe, Mr. Charles Lewis, Mr. Whalley, and Sir Michael Beach. The Chief Secretary was the only member of the Government who spoke.

It is impossible to deny that no occurrence of the session has created the same exasperation in Ireland. It has been said, that not only has a measure of justice for Ireland been rejected, but rejected with something approaching to contempt—that no attempt was made to answer the arguments, that I am bold to say—referring especially to those of the O'Connor Don—demonstrated the absolute necessity of some such measure—that no member of the Government intervened in the debate, with the necessary exception of the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant—that no serious reply was attempted on the part of the Government to a demand made by the whole Catholic clergy and people of Ireland, called for by the most numerous signed petitions that have for years been presented to Parliament by a people who had given up the habit of petitioning Parliament for redress.\* It seemed as if Government were determined to show that as far as their influence on the debate extended, such a demand was one that might be left to be dealt with by speakers with no official responsibility, and whose position in the House was not such as to entitle them to be the arbiters of such a question. The remark was made with some bitterness, that during a considerable portion of the debate the front ministerial benches were deserted, and that no Cabinet Minister, except the one who could not

\* The signatures to the petition in favour of the Bill exceeded 100,000. many of these signatures were those of the heads of corporations or other representative bodies, the seal or the signature being reckoned **only** as the signature of an individual.

avoid it, thought it worth while to take part in that debate. I am compelled to say, with sorrow and regret, that the words spoken by the Chief Secretary were but too well calculated to add to the exasperation. They were not worthy of himself or the occasion. They showed no careful consideration of the bearings of the subject upon which the Irish people have set their heart. The curt and slighting phrases in which he set aside the demand of that people resembled far more the language of a debater, who was obliged to say something, and, therefore, said what was smartest and readiest to hand, than the deliberate utterances of a minister who had weighed and considered, and thought over the demand, which expressed the wants and wishes of the Irish people. This (I cannot help saying) unfortunate speech had no little share in producing the angry feeling which has prevailed in Ireland on the subject, a feeling which was not diminished by the contradiction between that speech and the sentiments publicly expressed but a short time since by his chief. It would be difficult to reconcile the declarations of the Chief Secretary with the language used by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, once in the House of Commons, and before this in replying to the deputation of the Corporation of Dublin, headed by the Lord Mayor.\* It is not

\*SIR MICHAEL HICKS BEACH

at the close of his speech in the House of Commons, July 26th:—

"HE THOUGHT THERE WAS NO REAL OR PRESSING NECESSITY FOR FRAMING THIS OR ANY COGNATE BILL ON THE SUBJECT OF UNIVERSITY EDUCATION FOR IRELAND, and much less was he disposed to approve of the Bill of the honourable member for Limerick, or to recommend the House to depart from the policy on this great question that has been pursued for so many years."

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE

in reply to the Dublin deputation, May 9th:—

"You know as well as I do, what underlying fires there are in connection with such a question as that of University Education in Ireland, and I think you will excuse me if I do not plunge into the question further than to say, that I HAVE ALL ALONG CONSIDERED THIS IS A QUESTION WHICH OUGHT TO BE DEALT WITH, AND THAT THE STATEMENTS WHICH HAVE BEEN LAID BEFORE ME BY THIS DEPUTATION CONFIRM ME IN THAT OPINION."

A report of the interview between the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the deputation from the City of Dublin will be found in the Appendix.

to be wondered at if the incidents of this debate have been eagerly seized on by those who argue that all ordinary Parliamentary action is vain, and that the British House of Commons will never voluntarily entertain a question of doing justice to Ireland. Unhappily the feeling of irritation extends to those who are far removed from these extreme views, the very men to whom we must look to moderate and restrain them.

For myself I should be sorry to believe that the division or the incidents of this discussion represented the deliberate decision either of the ministers or the House. Of course in presenting the Bill to the House I never expected that the second reading could have commanded a majority, or that the Bill would have been accepted by ministers. The Chancellor of the Exchequer, in reply to the O'Connor Don, had warned us that there were provisions in the Bill which it would be very difficult for Government to adopt. But I did expect for the measure a different reception, and a larger number of supporters. I believe that but for the unfortunate circumstances under which the discussion took place it would have obtained both. I KNOW that but for those circumstances the division list in its favour would have exhibited a different result, and I feel confident that the debate would have taken such a course as would have elicited declarations from ministers very different from the hasty and ill-advised statements of the Chief Secretary.

The truth is, that the day which I myself selected, when the Chancellor of the Exchequer gave me my choice among several, turned out, by circumstances which no one could foresee, to be the worst in the entire session—the one least fitted for obtaining a fair discussion on any question, especially an Irish one. If any one who desires to understand this will take the trouble of looking at the votes and proceedings of the House of Commons, that on the 25th the Chancellor of the Exchequer had actually

moved the suspension of an Irish member for alleged wilful obstruction of the business of the House. That motion was adjourned to Friday, the 27th. I stood, if I may use the expression, on a narrow isthmus, between two raging seas. But if he will look to the proceedings of the 26th he will find that just before I rose to move the second reading of the University Bill the Chancellor of the Exchequer gave notice of the resolutions by which he proposed to prevent the obstruction of public business. These resolutions had been anxiously looked for, and their very nature made them calculated to monopolise attention. Any one who knows the House of Commons will bear me out in saying, that under such circumstances it would have been very difficult to obtain for any question, English, or Scotch, or Irish, the calm attention of that House. But there must be added to this, the undoubted fact that a great deal of exasperated feeling against everything Irish had been created. The subject I was to bring before the House was one exposed to great prejudice, and requiring of all others a calm and deliberate discussion. We had just as little attention from ministers as we had from the House of Commons. A Cabinet Council was held that very day, but it was no secret that the attention of ministers was engaged, not with the Irish University question, but with the resolutions they proposed to submit to the House of Commons. I and my friends were in a great degree prepared for this. I would have been happy if by any possibility we could have avoided bringing on the question at all, but such a course was obviously impossible. We would have gladly seized on any opportunity of escaping a division, which we knew would be no fair test of the feeling of the House.\*

\* I have said already that it is not with me a matter of inference or conjecture, but of absolute knowledge, when I say that there were members prepared to vote for us who were turned away in the excitement which was created by the proceedings which had then agitated the House of Commons to fever heat. The greatest loss we sustained was that of two members

Adverse, however, as was the division, we must not exaggerate its effect. The advocates of free university institutions had the victory in debate. No attempt was made, none could be made, to displace the fact which we made matter of demonstration, that the Catholic people of Ireland do not, under our present institutions, enjoy the advantages of university education. The speech of Mr. Lowe admitted, in the most unequivocal terms, the great grievance that exists. The more fantastic and inefficient the remedy, which was the only one his great ability could suggest, the stronger the proof that the grievance can be redressed, the injustice remedied only by giving to the Catholic people institutions framed in accordance with their own religious convictions.

The division demonstrated that a great majority of the Irish representatives (represented in that division by 56 to 14) are in favour of the establishment of university institutions that will meet the wishes and supply the wants of the Catholic people of Ireland.\* I have, for one, the most perfect confidence that if the advocates of such institutions exert themselves with prudence and earnestness, the words of Sir Stafford Northcote are not far off their realization, and that "the subject is one THAT MUST BE DEALT WITH." Nothing that passed in the last session in any degree shakes my confidence in this.

It is, perhaps, beyond the proper province of these remarks that I should offer any suggestions on the manner in which this result can best be brought about. I would strongly advise that whoever takes charge of

belonging to that which is called the advanced Liberal Party, who were prepared, not only to vote, but to speak for the measure, supporting it on the broad ground that whatever opinions they might entertain upon the abstract merits of secular or religious education, the question as to Ireland was one upon which the opinions and wishes of Irishmen must prevail.

\*In the Appendix will be found a summary of the Irish vote, taken from Mr. McAlister's Green Book.



this question during the next session should bring forward a general resolution declaring the necessity of a change in the university system of Ireland. I am just as convinced as I was two years ago, that it was essential to place before Parliament a detailed measure for the accomplishment of the object we have in view. It was this conviction that induced me to undertake the labour and the responsibility of preparing the measure which I did. But this once done remains on record as the practical embodiment of a plan which the Irish people were willing to accept. It appears to me that the next step is to urge on the attention of Parliament the monstrous nature of the grievance which is admitted, and call on ministers and Parliament to devise the means of remedying it. A resolution of this nature is not liable to be met by the objections or the cavils which can always be urged to some of the provisions of a bill. Such a resolution would leave open the question between a new college in the existing university, and the establishment and endowment of a separate university. I have given my reasons for preferring the former. But it does not at all follow that after inquiries such as no private individual can make, a ministry determined to do justice on this subject, might not find it more expedient to establish a separate university. In the pastoral quoted in the speech the Catholic prelates, with a wise liberality, have left it to Government to decide this question, asking only that in some form or other the benefits of University Education shall be extended to the people under their charge. I am disposed to believe that all the elements which enter into the determination of this question would best be ascertained by a Royal Commission, fairly and impartially appointed and almost mediating between those whose opinions must be consulted. This, however, must be a question for the Government. A general resolution affirming the necessity of new provisions for University Education is, in my

judgment, the form in which the subject ought to be brought before Parliament next year. We may, perhaps, hope that a time will be found for pressing such a resolution in a more tranquil state of the House of Commons' atmosphere, than that in which, unfortunately, I was compelled to make my attempt. The votes on the estimates for Irish University purposes will supply fair opportunities for renewing discussions, every renewal of which will make the justice of the Irish demand more plain. Indeed, as ministers have promised to introduce in the next session a plan for intermediate education in Ireland, the whole question of the principles on which educational institutions in Ireland ought to be regulated must come under full discussion. The great principle of freedom of religious teaching, and of equality between religious persuasions, is equally applicable to university, to intermediate, and to primary education.

But, I feel strongly that it is not inside but outside the walls of the House of Commons that this question must be carried. Efforts must be made to popularize the subject—to concentrate public opinion on the demand that the Catholic people shall have free access to university institutions, framed to meet their religious convictions on this subject of education. This is not an ecclesiastical or a church question—it is emphatically the question of the laity, who are suffering civil disabilities on account of their religious faith. It is not even a Catholic question. It is a national one. Every Irishman who loves his country must feel indignant that a large portion of his countrymen, no matter from what reason, are denied the advantages which ought to facilitate their access to higher education. In this the country suffers, and when the country suffers, every one of its inhabitants suffers too. I do not believe that it would be difficult to form a committee of Irishmen of different religious persuasions, who would take up the question in this spirit—who would

forward it in the way in which all political questions have been forwarded—by making efforts to engage public opinion, by circulating publications advocating their views—by pressing information both on ministers and members of Parliament. There never was a question pending upon which there is more room for effective action of this kind. On one side there are all the facts and all the arguments that considerations of either justice or expediency can suggest ; on the other there is nothing but prejudice and ignorance of the real state of Ireland. This is just the case in which, by the force of facts and arguments, both prejudice and ignorance will be overcome.

One object of such a committee should be to obtain clear and manifest proof that the class whose children are now excluded from university education, earnestly desire an institution in which they can obtain it without compromising any conviction of their conscience.

May I say that another great object should be to obtain, as far as possible, the co-operation of Irish Protestants. I believe they have an interest in the settlement of this question, as deep as that of Roman Catholics. The Protestant Church of Ireland, through its bishops and its laity, has repudiated education severed from religion, by declarations more solemn even than those which have come from the Catholic prelates. The Protestant people are attached in their hearts and souls to the principle of interweaving religious teaching with education. Surely they must know that they cannot have it for themselves without conceding it to the Roman Catholics.

But this is not all. Is any man really so incapable of political foresight as to imagine that Trinity College, venerable as it is, with its hold upon the respect of the people, can continue as it is, if nothing is done for the Catholic people ; or that the mushroom growth of the Queen's Colleges will survive the storm that will lay the

oak of the forest low. These institutions—let me rather speak of that one whose fall every true hearted Irishman would deplore, Trinity College—gives advantages to Protestants which are denied to Catholics. Once teach the Roman Catholics that there is no hope of equality for them, and human nature cannot expect them contentedly to leave in the hands of Protestants the means of distancing them unfairly in the race of life. The cry for abolition of all university endowments will be raised. Let us not deceive ourselves—it will have too much of justice to be resisted. In the changes and chances of political life, a ministry will be found ready to adopt a measure which will settle the Irish university question without offending English prejudice. Possibly, according to the plan suggested by Mr. Lowe, the revenues of Trinity College may be applied to the founding of exhibitions, to be awarded by a Government board—or in some scheme of a comprehensive university Trinity College may be suffered to retain the place of one of the petty schools that will supply candidates for degrees to an examining body in Dublin Castle. But, I repeat, that once tell the Catholic people of Ireland that there is no hope of their admission into university institutions, and the existence of anything in Ireland that could deserve the name of University Education is not far from its end. The system that is built upon any basis less broad than the welfare of the whole people is a house that has its foundation in the sand, it will not survive the storms and gusts of political excitement and passion, “when the rains descend, and the floods come, and the winds blow, and beat upon that house, it will fall, and great will be the fall thereof.”

I feel that in making these suggestions I have wandered far beyond any limits I had assigned to myself when I began to write. I know not whether they will be acted on or not. But I feel confident that it only needs

rightly directed efforts to obtain, in some form or other, a settlement of this question in such a manner as will satisfy the just demands of the Catholic people. But if it be not so, if these exertions be not made, or if made they are unsuccessful, I have the satisfaction of feeling that in endeavouring to obtain such a settlement I have borne my part, and that whatever is to be the result of an unwise refusal of the earnest entreaty of a nation for institutions in which their children could be educated, without compromising their conscientious convictions, I have no share in the responsibility of that refusal, or of consequences which I have earnestly striven to avert.

I. B.

*Dublin, October 31st, 1877.*





# S P E E C H .

---

SIR,

In moving the second reading of this Bill I believe it will be more convenient for the House that I should accompany the motion by a statement, not only of the leading features of the measure, but also of the principles and views with which it has been framed. It will be in the recollection of the House, that last year I introduced a Bill on this subject, containing similar provisions. I then made a statement of the nature of those provisions. \* The Bill, of which I now propose the second reading, is essentially the same as that of last year. There have been modifications in some of its provisions. Early in the present year a conference took place between myself and my friends, the member for Galway and the member for Mallow, and four prelates of the Roman Catholic Church. My friend the member for Roscommon, and my friend the member for Louth, who have placed their names with mine at the back of the Bill, were unable to attend that conference. The four prelates who were present were the Archbishop of Armagh (the Primate), the Archbishop of Cashel, the Bishop of Ardagh, and the Bishop of Killala. In consequence of that conference some modifications have been made, to which, when I state the provisions of the Bill, I will call the attention of the House. But still, sir, this Bill is my own. I last year carefully prepared it, after asking for information from all those who I thought would be most likely to enable me to form a correct judgment upon the feelings and opinions of those for whose benefit it was intended. The chief characteristic is that it provides, or endeavours to provide, for the defect that everyone admits to exist in the University Institutions of Ireland, by establishing and endowing a second college in the University of Dublin; but I feel also that the

question comes now in a different way before the House from that in which I was able to present it last year. It is quite true that there has been no formal acceptance of this Bill by the Roman Catholic hierarchy, but yet, sir, when we find that petitions have come from the people of Ireland, signed by more than 112,000 persons, with the assent of the Roman Catholic clergy, I think we may assume that the 61 members of Parliament who signed a requisition on the subject to the Chancellor of the Exchequer,\* were well warranted in stating that they had every reason to believe that this Bill would give satisfaction to the Irish people, and would be accepted by the Roman Catholic prelates—an impression, sir, which, so far as I myself and my friends are concerned, was more than borne out by the conference in which we took a part. I am far from saying that this is a Bill which the Roman Catholic hierarchy would frame if they had the power of legislating on the subject. No collective opinion has been pronounced, and I have therefore no authority to speak for the hierarchy. I know that there are some of them who would prefer a separate Roman Catholic University to a second college, but I have better authority than any mere verbal conversations for stating that they are ready to accept the institution of a second college in the University of Dublin, provided that second college is formed in accordance with the just claims of the Catholic people. In 1871 a pastoral was issued to the Roman Catholic people of Ireland, which was signed by all the Roman Catholic prelates, and in that pastoral, after stating the points which they considered necessary to be observed in any university institution intended for the Catholic people, they thus express themselves :—

“ All this can, we believe, be attained by modifying the constitution of the Dublin University, so as to admit of the establishment of a second college within it, in every respect equal to Trinity College, and conducted on purely Catholic principles, in which your bishops shall have full control in all things regarding

\* See Appendix C.



faith and morals, securing thereby the spiritual interests of your children, placing at the same time Catholics on a perfect equality with Protestants, as to degrees, emoluments, and other advantages."

Now, sir, what I ask the House to do in reading this Bill a second time is not to sanction every detail in which I have endeavoured to meet this proposal of the bishops, but only to assent to the principle that we should endeavour to meet it. It would be great presumption in me to say that I have succeeded in framing a plan by which all the difficulties that surround such an attempt had been overcome, but I can sincerely say that I am not without hopes that if you sanction the principle, and that if either the Ministry by a Royal commission, or this House by a select committee, endeavour honestly and fairly to collect the opinions and to meet the views of all those who must be consulted on such a measure, and if all parties in Ireland will act with forbearance and moderation, a measure may be framed upon the lines of that which I introduce which will give satisfaction to the Irish nation.

Before I proceed further, I trust the House will permit me to say one word upon a subject upon which I cannot say more. I would ask of every member of this House, whatever exasperation he may feel at any occurrences that have taken place, not to visit that upon this measure, but to deal with it upon the broad and great principles upon which such a measure should be decided. No greater calamity could befall this House than if any feelings of resentment at the conduct of individuals were to influence their vote upon a question which concerns not individuals but a nation.

In approaching this question we must first consider the amount of revenue derived from State endowments which is now applied to the purposes of university education in Ireland. Ireland has two universities—the Dublin University, composed only of Trinity College, and the Queen's University, instituted in 1845, with its three Colleges at Cork, Galway, and Belfast. To use a phrase which I find commonly employed in the report

of the English University Commissioners, the "external income"—meaning that derived from endowments and not from students' fees—at Trinity College does not much exceed £40,000 a year. In 1854 a Royal commission estimated its external income at £38,000 a year. A return of the member for Longford fixes it as high as £43,000. I am not concerned to account for the difference. I believe that in the last return there is included the annual produce of a sum paid to the college in compensation for the loss of ecclesiastical advowsons. Possibly there are also included in it an annual income of £2,000 derived from a gift of an estate by the Corporation of Dublin at the foundation of the college, and about an equal sum derived from an estate left to them by Provost Baldwin—neither of which may, perhaps, be properly called State endowments. But it is enough for me to say that at no time has the revenue derived from State endowments of Trinity College amounted to £45,000, even including an estate yielding about £1,000 a year, which has been left separately to the Provost. The Queen's Colleges have each £7,000 a year settled on the Consolidated Fund. That is beyond the control of this House. This year we have voted in the estimates for the Queen's University £4,634, for the colleges £11,800; but of this latter sum about £6,000 is repaid by fees collected from pupils, and which, under an arrangement with the Treasury, are paid into the public exchequer. This, therefore, would leave the grant voted this year for the Queen's University, including its colleges, at something about £10,000. In addition to this there is a small vote for the repairs and maintenance of buildings in the colleges the expense of which is borne by the public exchequer.

This would leave the sum derived from public sources for university institutions in Ireland thus:—For Trinity College, derived from endowments in land, £43,000 a year; for the Queen's University and the colleges composing it, £21,000, settled by act of Parliament, and £10,000 voted on the estimates, making the endowment of the Dublin University £43,000, and of the Queen's Colleges £33,000, or altogether, £76,000. It will perhaps have surprised hon. members, some of whom have talked of the enormous wealth of Trinity College, to be told

that the University of Dublin has only £10,000 a year more of endowment than the Queen's University and its colleges.

Now, I will ask the House for a moment to contrast this with the state of things existing in England. We have voted this year for the London University a sum of £10,670, a little more than we have voted for the Queen's University in Ireland. But if we look to the elder universities we there see a remarkable contrast. I need not say, sir, that Trinity College has all the powers and bears all the expenses of a university. Its income, therefore, is not to be treated as that of a college. The University of Oxford has, in its separate capacity as a university, an endowment producing £29,000; the external income of its colleges and halls derived from lands amounts to £307,000 a year—making a total income of £335,000. The external income of Cambridge University amounts to £13,000; that of its colleges and halls to £264,000—making a total income to Cambridge University of £277,000. The united income of the two English universities derived from endowments amounts to £613,000 a year. That is in contrast with the income of £43,000 enjoyed by the University of Dublin, which of late years has been supplemented by £30,000 a year voted to the Queen's Colleges. It is right to observe that as a means of making provision for their fellows, Oxford University has benefices in the gift, either of the University or its colleges, the annual income of which is £137,000, and Cambridge has benefices with an annual income of £135,000. I might, sir, be tempted to stop and show what Trinity College has done for many generations on an endowment that never amounted in any year to £40,000, and how it maintained an honourable competition of which no Irishman need feel ashamed, with the two great English universities endowed with more than £600,000 a year! But I would use the contrast, as supplying me with an unanswerable argument in favour of the proposal which this Bill makes, that out of a fund, that in fact, represents the endowments provided by our ancestors in ancient times—I mean the surplus of the property of the Disestablished Church—provision should be made for the absolute necessities of Irish University Education.

Now let me ask the attention of the House to the state of things that actually exists in Ireland. From the benefit of university institutions the great mass of the people are practically excluded; and I may observe in passing that in addition to these university endowments there are in Ireland some small endowments for intermediate schools, but including these in the observation that I make, there is not in the whole of Ireland, from one end of it to the other, a single endowed educational institution in accordance with the convictions and religious belief of the Irish people. I cannot, perhaps, express this better than by quoting the words in which it was stated by the right hon. gentleman the member for Greenwich, then Chancellor of the Exchequer, in a speech delivered by him at Southport on the 19th December, 1867:—

“At the present moment no university degree can be granted in Ireland except in Trinity College, Dublin, where the system of the Established Church is taught, and in the Queen’s Colleges and various places where no system of religion is taught at all as a part of the system of education; and if there be Roman Catholics—and there are numbers of them—who hold in Ireland the very same opinion that we hold in England—viz., to prefer having their children trained in establishments where their own religion is taught, these children are deprived from the privilege of a university degree, and as that degree is a civil privilege, it comes to this—that there are still in Ireland civil disabilities on account of religious opinion. Now, we would not bear that ourselves.”

Now, sir, when I have said that there is not an educational institution in Ireland receiving a State endowment which is in accordance with the religious convictions and belief of the Irish people, I have stated a national grievance of no ordinary kind. You have endowed institutions founded on principles adverse to those convictions and that belief. You have institutions like your endowed schools and like Trinity College, essentially Protestant in their character. You have institutions like the

Queen's Colleges, representing a form of teaching still more repulsive to the feelings of the Irish people—I mean a form that altogether excludes religious teaching; but a single institution in harmony with the feelings of those who constitute the majority of the people you have not.

I do not know that I ought to take up the time of the House in adducing statistical proofs, but the result is that a very small proportion of Roman Catholics avail themselves of University Education in Ireland. I have no wish to enter into any controversy as to the Queen's Colleges, but every one knows that they have failed in attracting to them Roman Catholic students. I will take the total number attending lectures in the three Queen's Colleges in the sessions of 1875 and 1876, as I find them in the last reports of those colleges. In October, 1876, Galway had 156 students, of whom 82 were Roman Catholics; Cork had 250, of whom 131 were Roman Catholics; and Belfast 393, of whom 11 were Roman Catholics—making in all 224 Roman Catholics attending in that year lectures in those three colleges. At the end of 1874 I find a statement contained in the report of the President of the Belfast College that the total number attending lectures in the three colleges was 781, of whom 217 were Roman Catholics. But, sir, I quite agree with a remark which was made by the right hon. gentleman, the member for Greenwich, in 1873, that the larger proportion of those attending the lectures at the Queen's Colleges are not attending them for the purpose of University Education in its proper sense, but to acquire technical or professional knowledge. The schools of medicine, of engineering, and of law, do not represent persons who come for the purpose of University training. It is only the faculty of arts that we ought to consider in estimating the number of persons really coming for University Education. In Belfast, at the end of 1876, there were only 119 students in the Faculty of Arts; in Cork, 51; and in Galway, 53. About one-third of the entire number of students were matriculated in the Faculty of Arts. We have 223 students in all the three colleges matriculated in arts. How many of those are Roman Catholics? Let us assume that in those 223 the

proportion of Roman Catholics is the same as it is in the entire body of the students. You have 70 Roman Catholics matriculated in arts—that is only 70 really university students belonging to the Roman Catholic Church. And I believe this is the real proportion of Roman Catholic students in the Queen's Colleges. To this, however, we must add the Roman Catholics who are receiving their education in the University of Dublin. Mr. Gladstone, in his speech in this House in 1873, estimated the number of these at 100. It is, of course, easy to attain the exact number, but I should be disposed to fix them at 70.\* But even taking them at 100, we have of the whole Roman Catholic population of Ireland but 170 availing themselves of university education—a number so disproportioned to the Roman Catholic population as to prove in itself that our university institutions are vitally defective.

But, sir, this is not a religious but a national grievance. If we add to the 223 students in arts in the Queen's University all that have matriculated in Dublin, we have not altogether more than 1,100 persons in Ireland seeking for university education. This is a number which shows that a large proportion of the people of Ireland do not receive the benefits of a university education who might be expected to do so.

Let me stop for a moment to observe that no matter how it was intended no delusion could be more gross than that which would imagine that anything like religious equality had

\*Since this speech was delivered I obtained an order for returns, both from Trinity College and the Queen's University which would accurately represent the number of Roman Catholic students in each of those institutions.

That from Trinity College has been some time printed. It appears that the number of Roman Catholic students on the books of Trinity College amounts to 75.

Of these 12 are resident within the College walls.

In the last ten years 105 Roman Catholics have taken the degree of Bachelor of Arts.

In the five years that have elapsed since the passing of "Mr. Fawcett's Bill," four Roman Catholics have been admitted to scholarships.

As the entire number of 70 scholarships fall vacant in the ordinary course within five years, four out of seventy may be considered as the nominal proportions of Roman Catholic scholars.

The returns will be found in the appendix. For some reason or other the return for the Queen's Colleges has not yet been printed.

been established in Trinity College by the bill which bears the name of the member for Hackney. That college is still essentially a Protestant institution. There is a college chapel in which Divine worship is conducted according to the rites of the Protestant Church. There is no building in which it is celebrated according to the Roman Catholic form. There are 70 scholarships in Trinity College, and since the passing of that Bill three of those scholarships have been obtained by Roman Catholics. If, indeed, any of those things which would establish religious equality were to happen—if there were Roman Catholic fellows equal in number to the Protestant—if Mass were celebrated in a building set apart for that purpose; if a Roman Catholic ecclesiastic or even a Roman Catholic layman were nominated Provost, I am quite sure that the effect would be that Protestants would leave Trinity College, and it would become utterly unsuited for the purposes of a Protestant university education. But none of these things have happened, and none of them will happen in the present generation, and while the youngest of us is alive Trinity College under its present constitution will continue a Protestant institution.

I think I have gone far enough to show that if you want to supply the opportunities of university education to the whole Irish people, some new element must be introduced. This is a social as well as a religious and national grievance. If there be anything in university education it must give the man who receives it some advantage in social life. It was only when I began to study the question and to collect information on the subject that I perfectly understood the unfair advantage which our present educational arrangements give to the Protestant. In every department of life he has an advantage. He has the means of education supplied by the State which are not open to the Roman Catholic. This constitutes a religious ascendancy of the very worst kind, because it rests upon condemning a large proportion of the people to inferiority of education.

Now, how are we to remedy this? We can do it in one of two ways—either by creating a separate Catholic



University, or by establishing a second college in the Dublin University suited to meet the wants and the wishes of the Catholic people. I myself, sir, am an advocate for the second college. A long time must elapse before any new university, however well and wisely conducted, could acquire for its degrees the *prestige* which belongs to those of the elder university. That university has many great traditions and many proud recollections. The names of Grattan, of Burke, of Curran, of most of the men whose names have become household words in Irish history are connected with it. I wish to make our Roman Catholic countrymen sharers in all those traditions—traditions which we have acquired as a national university, and in which, therefore, they have a right to share.

But in introducing this Bill in this shape, permit me to restate the position which I occupy. I brought in this Bill on my own responsibility—a responsibility shared only with the friends who allowed me to associate their names with mine in introducing it. I brought it in as a member of this House, as a member of the Senate of the Dublin University. I wished for a second college for the sake of the university itself—for the sake of the Protestants of Ireland—for the sake of the Roman Catholics of Ireland. I preferred this to the establishment of a separate university. I think the great principles on which such a bill ought to be founded are these : To give the Roman Catholics a college in which they can receive education according to their convictions ; and it is vain to disguise from ourselves that this involves the giving to the Roman Catholic bishops as much control as the Catholic people of Ireland believe their religion requires that they should have. Another principle must be to place Roman Catholics practically on an equality with Protestants in endowments, and, as far as possible, in the *prestige* that should belong to the degrees they would obtain. But there are other objects also to be kept in view. We are not to impair the efficiency of Trinity College as an institution for the education of Protestants. We are not to lower the standard of university education ; nor are we to place university education under that Government control which has been fatal to every university system over which it has thrown its withering shadow.



Let me in the first place advert to the declaration of the Roman Catholic prelates in 1871 to which I have already referred. They then stated what they considered requisite for the higher education of the country. I am quoting from a pastoral which, as I have said, they all signed in 1871 :—

“ As regards higher education (we repeat the words of the resolutions adopted by the archbishops and bishops of Ireland in August, 1869), since the Protestants of this country have had a Protestant University, with rich endowments, for 300 years, and have so still, the Catholic people of Ireland equally have a right to a Catholic University. But should her Majesty's Government be unwilling to increase the number of universities in this country, religious equality cannot be realised unless the degrees, endowments, and other privileges enjoyed by our fellow-subjects of a different religion be placed within reach of Catholics on terms of perfect equality. The injustice of denying to us a participation in those advantages, except at the cost of principle and conscience, is aggravated by the consideration, that whilst we contribute our share to the public funds for the support of educational institutions from which conscience warns us away, we have, moreover, to tax ourselves for the education of our children in our own colleges and universities. Should it please her Majesty's Government, therefore, to remove the many grievances to which Catholics are subjected by existing university arrangements, and to establish one national university in this kingdom for examining candidates and conferring degrees, the Catholic people of Ireland are entitled in justice to demand that in such university or annexed to it they shall have one or more colleges conducted upon purely Catholic principles, and at the same time fully participating in the privileges enjoyed by other colleges of whatsoever denomination or character; that the university honours and emoluments be accessible to Catholics equally with their Protestant fellow-subjects; that the examinations and all other details of university arrangement be free from every influence hostile to the religious sentiments of Catholics; and that with this view the Catholic element be adequately represented

upon the senate or other supreme university body by persons enjoying the confidence of the Catholic bishops, priests, and people of Ireland."

I cannot think that those requisitions were unreasonable ; they were followed up by the passage I have already quoted, in which the prelates stated their belief that they could all be satisfied by the establishment of a second college in the University of Dublin.

When we come to consider the mode of establishing a second college, we cannot overlook the fact that we already have an institution founded by Catholics—founded and supported by Catholic liberality, acknowledged by the Catholic people as worthy of their support, and endeavouring under extreme circumstances to supply to that people the benefits of a higher education—I mean, of course, the institution known as the Catholic University. It has been several years in existence. The Commissioners of Science and Art reported, two or three years ago, that £200,000 had been subscribed by the Catholic people in support of the institution. No doubt a large proportion of this has been expended in the annual support of the institution, but a portion still remains available in its buildings and other property. That institution enjoys the good-will and confidence of the Irish Catholic people. It is not easy to convey to members of this assembly the exact position which it occupies in Ireland. I can only say that it has among its professors men of the highest eminence in several of the walks of science. It has won the respect of all classes, including the leading men of Trinity College, and many interchanges of civility attest the readiness on the part of Trinity College to acknowledge it among the new institutions of the country.

It is too common to impute to Roman Catholic education a tendency to restrain the freedom of thought. The Catholic University has an historical and literary society, in which topics—as in the kindred institutions of other universities—are freely discussed. It has been frequently my lot to be

present at the opening meetings of the society, where the president delivered an inaugural address, and I believe there is no one who has been present on those occasions who would not bear me out in saying that nowhere has there been displayed more perfect freedom and liberality of thought and reasoning than in the addresses to which we have had the good fortune to listen ; and, I must add, sir, that among the men educated at that Catholic University I have found as true liberality of thought, as entire an absence of sectarianism and bigotry, and a tone of thought as free and enlarged as I have met with among any class with whom I am acquainted. I believe it would be the extreme of folly that could induce us to disregard the claims of this institution, to be accepted as possessing all the attributes which fit it—eminently fit it to be a college, representing Catholic thought and intellect in the University of Dublin. I therefore, sir, propose in this Bill to offer to the chiefs of that institution the option of a charter and incorporation as a second college in the University of Dublin. I do not propose to affiliate any other seminary or institution with the University. I propose that Trinity College and this Catholic College should at present constitute the sole members of the University, and while the Bill provides for new colleges that may be founded in future times, it enacts that all those colleges should be situated within a short distance of the centre of Dublin. I have no wish to discuss the Bill which was introduced in 1873, by the right hon. gentleman the member for Greenwich. I am quite ready to do justice to the liberality of sentiment which marked the framing of that Bill. I believe that it was dictated by a sincere desire to do justice to the Irish people in this vital matter of university education, and I do not stop now to inquire into the causes of its failure. But I cannot help remarking that I believe the attempt to affiliate to the University in Dublin a number of seminaries in the country was one of the causes of that failure, because it was felt by every Irishman that this must have the effect of lowering the standard of university education. That I am not speaking this without reason I think I can satisfy the House. The opinion of the Catholic laity was against that

proposal. I hope the House will pardon me if I refer to an address which was presented a short time ago to myself by a large number of the professors and students and ex-students of the Catholic University. In that address they pointed out the preference which they give to the Bill I have framed, because it did not lower the standard of university education in Ireland. Speaking of Mr. Gladstone's Bill, they say—

“That it proposed to associate with Trinity College, under the Dublin University, not a great institution, which might act as an intellectual centre for the Catholics of Ireland, and which might afford them some hope of recovering the reputation which Catholic Ireland once possessed for learning. Instead of giving a centre of Catholic thought, it would have tacked on to the University of Dublin a number of schools and seminaries scattered throughout the country, amongst which company the Catholic University was admitted without one penny of endowment, without any one special advantage, without any one distinguishing characteristic, which could enable it as the heart of the Irish Catholic educational system to diffuse life and vigour throughout the members of that system.”

And they added that had that Bill passed,

“A central examining board—a weak resemblance of the London University—the Catholics of Ireland might thenceforth have had; but university education in the true and high sense of the term they never could have hoped for.”

And they contrast with this the Bill which I have introduced by saying that my proposal,

“Is not to drag the Catholic University and a great college into an ill-assorted union with a number of smaller seminaries scattered throughout the country—a union which might be able to degrade the college to the level of a seminary, but which never could elevate a seminary to the standard of a college.”

I have ventured to quote these sentences as indicating what I believe to be the general opinion of the educated Catholic laity. They desire that the standard of university education should be maintained, and that whatever be the collegiate or university institution, that would give them justice in the matter of higher education, it should in its requirements be upon a level with the old established universities of the kingdom.

I come now, sir, to explain the proposals this Bill makes as to the constitution and government of the two colleges which I propose to bring together in the University. The Catholic University is at present largely under the control of twelve of the Roman Catholic bishops of Ireland. It is proposed to preserve that body, under the title of Committee of Founders—a title which simply records a fact. But, sir, in almost all the powers which they are to exercise it is proposed that there are to be associated with them twelve laymen. The twelve bishops and the twelve associated laymen are to form a body to be called the Senate of the College. The first twelve laymen are to be named in the Bill, and in future vacancies among those laymen are to be filled up alternately by an election by the graduates of the college and of the senate. This addition of laymen to the council of bishops was suggested by the prelates who met myself and my friends in the conference which I have already mentioned.

In addition to the Senate there is to be a collegiate council, consisting of twelve, four to be nominated by the senate, four by the professors of the college, and four by the graduates. The graduates are to assemble in a separate body, to be called the congregation of graduates. These three bodies—the senate, composed as I have described, the collegiate council, and the congregation of graduates, are to constitute the governing bodies of the Catholic College. The professors, who are to hold their office for life, or during good behaviour, are to be elected in this way—three names are to be recommended by the collegiate council, of whom the senate is to choose one. The power of making ordinances on certain subjects connected with the discipline and arrangements of the college is intrusted to the senate; other matters are to be regulated by the collegiate

council; but it is provided that no change can be made in any regulation contained in the act, without the assent of the Lord Lieutenant and Privy Council of Ireland.

These, sir, are the outlines of the mode in which we propose that the new Catholic College should be constituted. It is, I think, a subject which ought to be left greatly to the Roman Catholic people themselves. I believe that the mode in which we propose that the government of the college should be arranged would be found such as will meet with their approbation. But I cannot too often or too strongly repeat that I do not rest this Bill either on this point or any other point upon a perfect agreement on its details. I am bold to say, sir, that I have framed a measure which proves the possibility of uniting in one university a Protestant and a Catholic College. I have prepared rules for the government of the Catholic College, to which I do not think this House, if it is really prepared to deal with this subject on the principle of religious toleration, can object. But all the details of that plan are open to discussion and amendment. You will only have to take care that in amending it you do not destroy the Catholic character of the proposed college, so as to unfit it for the education of Catholics. I may observe that in respect to this the liberty of the Catholics is fully protected. Under this Bill no institution hostile to their convictions can ever be established. It rests with the governing body of the Catholic University to accept or reject the charter which will be offered to them under this measure in the shape in which it will ultimately pass.

So much as to the Catholic College. As to Trinity College I have very little to say. The management is still left in the hands of the Provost and Senior Fellows—of an academic council, elected in the same manner as at present—and of a congregation of graduates substituted for convocation. As, of course, in future the graduates of the other college would become members of the convocation of the university, a congregation exclusively composed of the graduates of Trinity College must be substituted for convocation in the powers that are to be exercised over the arrangements of the college itself.

The University of Dublin would remain as at present, with a vice-chancellor elected by convocation, and with the addition of an academic or university council—composed of seven persons to be selected by the governing body of each college, two more by the graduates of Trinity College, and two by those of the new college. These eighteen persons, with the chancellor and vice-chancellor, I propose should constitute the academic council; and to the council I largely intrust the ordinary management of university examinations and other matters relating to the daily life, I may say, of the University. Statutes of the University are only to be made with the assent of the academic council and of convocation, and no statute can be made unless it had obtained the assent both of the Provost and Senior Fellows of Trinity College and of the Senate of the Catholic College. No one I think can say that this is unreasonable or unfair. The terms upon which the two colleges combine in one university may fairly be considered as a contract which ought not to be altered without the consent of both.

I now come to state the provisions which the Bill contains as to the mode of obtaining degrees. It is substantially that in force at present both by the University of Dublin and the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge. I propose that degrees should be conferred as at present by the convocation of the university, comprising all graduates of the higher degrees, and conferred by that convocation with all the forms and observances hitherto in use. The degree of Bachelor of Arts is to be obtained as it is now, after the candidate has passed four years in one of the colleges, attending lectures, and complying with all the regulations which his college may make. During this period he would be required to pass two university examinations: one at the end of two years and the other when he offers himself as candidate for his degree. These university examinations are to be conducted by a board of examiners, appointed by the academic council, and in the Bill itself the course to be used at these examinations is prescribed. It may seem an unusual thing to include in the Bill the university course of examination which should qualify a person for a degree, but there are reasons which



make it expedient to do so when you are combining two different colleges in one university. Perhaps it will surprise some members to be told that in the course there is to be found provision for examination both in history and moral philosophy. As to the qualification for the lower degrees, I will not detain the House by pointing out the subjects which by the Bill are made necessary for passing the university examinations, and also prescribed as subjects to be taught in the colleges; but, I venture to say, that if anyone will take the trouble of looking over the schedule to the Bill he will admit that the course of study prescribed for the students is such as in no degree to lower the standard of university education in Ireland, and is in liberality and completeness equal to the requirements of any university in the United Kingdom, and I am also sure that the more any one examines it the more convinced he will be that the apprehension that Catholics will resist the introduction of the highest branches of human knowledge is a groundless one, especially when he learns how many of the books mentioned in that schedule have been taken from the course prescribed by the Catholic University. It will be remembered that the table of university studies may at any time be altered with the consent of both colleges, and that either college may of its own authority add to that table any books or subjects it thinks fit to appoint for its own students.

As for the higher degrees they are left under the control of the University. The Bill leaves to the University of Dublin all the powers it now possesses of granting degrees, with the exception of degrees in divinity, but it authorises each college to grant a diploma conferring the title of D.D.—a diploma, however, which would confer no university right. I ought to have mentioned that there is a provision that the council of bishops may appoint in the Catholic college professors of divinity—as professors of divinity exist in Trinity College; but there is also a provision that none of the revenues conferred upon the college by the act should be applied to payment of such professors, and to prevent the same thing being done indirectly there is a provision that no theological professor should hold any other office or professorship in the college. This has recalled my attention to a



statement which I have omitted to make in its proper place, I trust the House will permit me now to supply the omission. A provision has been introduced this year into the Bill, that the vice-chancellor, instead of being appointed at the absolute discretion of the chancellor, should be selected from three names to be furnished to him alternately by each college, the vice-chancellorship to be held for a period of three years.

With respect, however, to the obtaining of degrees, I ask the particular attention of the House to a provision to which I attach the greatest value. The House will permit me fully to explain this. It always has been the habit of the University of Dublin to allow persons to obtain degrees by passing certain examinations in the year, without residence, and without attending lectures. The Bill proposes to continue this. Recently students have been admitted into the English universities without entering any college; and it is proposed to adopt this plan in the Irish university, so that any student who does not desire to enter either of the colleges might matriculate as a member of the university, without residence or attendance on lectures at either college. By these means any person who acquires the requisite knowledge may obtain his degree, receiving his education in any place he thought fit, or educating himself—the only requisite being that he would prove that he was following the university course by regular attendance at examinations; and that in addition to this he should be able to pass the two University examinations, to which persons receiving their education in the two colleges would be subjected. I will not dwell upon the advantages of this. In opening the advantages of the university to persons who do not choose to become members of either the Catholic or Protestant College, it makes education free. Every one is offered the benefit of an education with which religion is combined; but no one is compelled to accept it. In the next place, it would have the effect of enabling young men to obtain a university degree whose parents may not be able to afford the expense of collegiate residence; and further, it would be the introduction of a wholesome element of competition with the colleges, for unless the advantages afforded by the two colleges was such as to make it worth the while of the

student to undergo the expense and inconvenience of collegiate residence, it is obvious that many at all events would avail themselves of the privilege. Persons, in fact, who from any motive might have an objection to enter either of the colleges, would find the means of obtaining a degree and also admission to compete for all the emoluments and honours of the university without doing so. Consequences will, no doubt, follow from this, upon which I do not wish at present to detain the House. It is possible that in a few years halls might be founded in which students belonging to some particular denominations may find a home in the city of Dublin, while proceeding to their degree in the university. I ought to add that there is a provision in the Bill, that any student who should matriculate in the university may avail himself at a small charge of any of the lectures given in any college.

Having thus briefly sketched the constitution of the colleges and of the university, I will now ask the attention of the House to the endowments which this Bill proposes for them. Trinity College is already endowed, as I have stated, with £43,000 a year. In the Bill of 1873, it was proposed that Trinity College should contribute in money a sum of £12,000 a year to maintain the university. This Bill does not propose to impose any pecuniary contribution upon Trinity College, but I do propose that that body should contribute to the university something that would be much more valuable than money. There are now seventy scholarships in Trinity College, which, with rooms and free commons and a small stipend, were worth about £60 a year each. These, of course, can now only be obtained by students in Trinity College, but this, remember, is to say that they are open to all students in the university. They are sought after with an earnestness which their money value does not account for. The Scholarship Roll contains the names of many Irishmen from Edmund Burke downwards, who had been illustrious in former times. The Bill proposes that those scholarships should still be open to all students of the university, under its enlarged institution. If one should be obtained by a student who was not a member of Trinity College it gives him the choice either of becoming a

member of the college, or of receiving from the college an annual sum equivalent to the worth of the scholarship. It would be to him a grant of £60 a year for five years, during which the scholarship could be held, and it is proposed that it should carry with it the privilege of voting for the representatives of the university, a privilege given by the first charter but reserved in the Reform Bill, even for undergraduate scholars, and which attaches a peculiar value to the obtaining of the honour. Again, the number of fellows in Trinity College is now excessive. I propose that ten of these fellowships should be converted into university fellowships, and that each of those ten fellows should receive from Trinity College the same stipend as would be paid to him if he were elected a fellow of the college. That stipend is a very small one, and would, of course, not include any of the fees for tuitions which he might have received as a fellow of college. In addition to this stipend each of the ten fellows would be entitled to receive from the university revenues as much as would increase his total income to £200 a year. There are also professorships which are virtually university professorships, although the salaries of the professors are paid out of the revenues of Trinity College, which, as I have already pointed out to the House, out of its endowment of £43,000 a year bears all the expenses of a university as well as a college. The Bill proposes that they should still be so paid, but that their nomination should rest with the University Council. The professorships with which it is proposed so to deal, are the Royal Professorship of Astronomy, with a salary of £700 a year, independent of a residence in the university and several acres of land; the Regius Professor of Law, who has a salary of £500 a year; the Regius Professor of Physic and Surgery, and last, but not least, of Music. These five professorships would continue on the college revenues a charge of more than £2,000 a year. On the transfer of the fellowships, there would be another annual contribution of £1,000 a year, and the surrender of the seventy foundation scholarships, taking each of them at £60 a year, would be a money contribution of £4,200 a year, the bill thus imposing on the revenues of Trinity College an annual charge

of £8,000. In addition to this there are fourteen studentships of £100 a year each, recently founded by the board. It is proposed that those should be open to all students of the university, making a further contribution of £1,400 a year. So that in all Trinity College would bestow upon the university places maintained out of its own revenues of the value of more than £9,000 a year. The Bill of 1873 required them to contribute in money an annual sum of £12,000, which I believe would not have been of the same value to the university as the places which under this Bill they would bestow. In addition there are a number of small prizes and medals which I propose to make open to all students in the university. They are small in amount, but of great value in associating the university in its remodelled form with the traditions of the past. Besides this, the Bill gives to the university an interest in the library, including a magnificent collection of ancient Irish manuscripts, all of which are now the exclusive property of Trinity College.

All the university places and endowments I have yet mentioned would be provided by the transfer of these places from Trinity College to the university. It would, I believe, be more correct to say that they belong to Trinity College not so much in its collegiate as in its university character, and that in giving them to the university we are only retaining them for their original purpose. If that be so, this is the just and proper form in which we should make the revenues of Trinity College contribute to the university under its new form. But in addition to the places thus derived from Trinity College the Bill proposes that provision should be made by the university, independent of either of the colleges, for university fellowships and scholarships. The Bill proposes that there should be fifteen university fellowships, held for life, and endowed each with £100 a year; and the Bill also provides that there should be given away every year two exhibitions of £100 a year, tenable for five years. There are also exhibitions attached to some of the endowed schools which it is proposed to throw open for competition among all the students of the university, instead of their being limited, as they were, to pupils from those schools.

I would propose, therefore, that there should be given away the following prizes and fellowships. There would be open to all its graduates—25 fellowships worth £200 a year, and 10 exhibitions worth £100 a year. To all its undergraduates—70 scholarships worth £60, and 30 exhibitions varying from £50 to £20 a year. The undergraduates' scholarships and exhibitions would be provided out of funds independent of the university, and half of the expense of ten fellowships would be borne by Trinity College, so that the charge upon the university revenues would be 15 fellowships at £200 each, half of ten fellowships at £100 a year each, and ten exhibitions at £100 a year each. All those together would make an annual charge on the University revenues of £5,000.

But, in addition to these prizes, for those who have already entered the university, I propose an application of university funds to a purpose, which, if time permitted, I would be glad to dwell at greater length, because I regard it as one of the most valuable provisions of the measure I propose. It is an attempt to give to struggling merit the aid which may enable many a youth of promise to elevate himself to advantages to which without that aid he might never have made his way. The Bill provides ample securities that the aid so given shall be really used for the purpose it is intended, and in reality this proposal does something to redress the wants of Ireland in regard to educational endowment for that which is called intermediate education. I propose to place at the disposal of the University authorities 50 exhibitions of £20 a year each, tenable for three years, to be given to young men who might be desirous of fitting themselves for the university, and who might require pecuniary assistance, adding an expenditure of 3,000 a year, and making the total charge £8,000, to be expended in the manner I have mentioned. I do not think anyone would say that I ask too large an endowment to enable the university to meet all these purposes, and provide for its own necessary expenses, in proposing that the Church Commissioners should provide out of their surplus a sum of £300,000, bearing interest at the rate of four per cent. If it continued to produce the same amount of income, after providing

for these fellowships and prizes and the pensions in aid of poor students, the university would have a sum of £4,000 a year at its disposal for all other purposes under certain restrictions which I need not now particularize. I propose to leave this sum at the disposal of the academic council, with, however, a provision that none of it should be applied in any way except providing for the ordinary expenditure of the university, except by a vote in which two-thirds of the council concurred.

For the endowment of the new college I propose that as soon as the charter shall be accepted the sum of £30,000 should be handed over to the college to provide suitable buildings. It is desirable that the Irish people should manifest their continued interest in the maintenance of a Catholic University institution, and I, therefore, propose that before any other sum is handed over, the trustees of the Catholic College should be able to place at the disposal of its authorities a sum of £30,000. The House would remember that nearly £200,000 had been already subscribed. The £30,000 would, therefore, make up £230,000 supplied by the contributions of the Catholic people. Upon this being done the Bill proposes that double the sum should be handed over out of the Church surplus to form a permanent endowment for the new Catholic College. That would make the charge on the Church surplus in all amount to £800,000—£30,000 for buildings, £460,000 for endowment for the new Catholic College, and £300,000 in endowment of the University, and a grant of £30,000 for university buildings.

I have now stated to the House the outline of the Bill, omitting of course minute details which would have wearied you, without enabling you better to understand the proposal. The main principle of the proposal is the establishment of a second college in the University of Dublin, making the second college of such a character as to provide education for the Catholic people in accordance with their convictions and their faith, and also to offer to every Irishman the power of obtaining a degree without being obliged to submit himself to any peculiar instruction. Let me repeat that the latter point is secured by the provision to which I have already directed attention

of admitting persons to degrees who matriculated in the University without entering either college. Both colleges the Bill makes as far as possible independent and self-governing. It gives to each of them the equal share in the management of the university, but leaves to each college the power of making such regulations as the college itself might think expedient to advance within its own walls the interests of science or of education. And to leave them perfectly free in this it proposes that the act prohibiting the requirement of religious qualifications should no longer apply to the colleges, although it is retained in full force as to the university. As to the regulations of the Catholic College, this is a matter which we ought to leave almost entirely to the Roman Catholic people themselves. As to the relations which united the two colleges, they are of course a matter open to consideration, and upon which it may be found possible, and even advantageous, to modify some of the proposals I have made. All I ask the House now to do in reading the Bill a second time is to affirm the principle of the establishment of a Catholic College in the University of Dublin without pledging itself to any of the particular details by which the measure is proposed to be carried out.

The proposal of the Catholic College is not new. Up to the year 1794 Catholics were not admissable into Trinity College. They were excluded, first by the statutes of the College, and secondly, by an Act of Parliament, which prohibited Catholics from taking degrees. In that year the statutes of the College were modified by Royal authority so as to dispense in the case of Roman Catholics with any observances which would interfere with their religion, and in the same year the Irish Parliament repealed the act which excluded them from degrees. I will ask the House to remember that this was done by the exclusively Protestant Parliament of Ireland long before Dissenters of any kind were admitted to degrees in either of the English Universities, or even to matriculate at Oxford.

But the Irish Parliament went further, and they enacted that a second college might be instituted in which Catholics could hold fellowships, provided that it was not exclusively for Catholics, and that it was a member of the University of Dublin. I have not,



sir, the slightest doubt that, had the Irish Parliament continued its existence, this liberal measure would have been long since carried out, and a second college in such a form as would then have satisfied the Roman Catholics, would have been endowed out of the revenues of Ireland. It is strange that now, after the lapse of eighty-four years, I have still to ask of the British Parliament to carry out the act of justice and liberality which the Protestant Parliament of Ireland had contemplated. Eleven years have passed since Mr. Gladstone pronounced in favour of the establishment of a Catholic College ; two generations of youths have passed into the world during the interval, and all that time the British Parliament has been hesitating to deal with the matter. Five years embrace the period of life within which university education is usually sought. In this view it may be almost said, that since that declaration two generations of young men have passed into the battle of life, bereft of the advantages of that Catholic University education which would have fitted them for its trials, and it may be, trained them for its triumphs. For them, these years, which should have been those of that education and that training, are gone for ever, and still the British Parliament is hesitating. Is it not time that this great question were settled? A golden opportunity is presented to you. A spirit of conciliation, of concession, has been manifested by the Catholic prelates and clergy of Ireland ; men without whose co-operation you never can settle it. Will Parliament meet them in the same spirit? Deal with this subject in the spirit of a large liberality and toleration! Remember, you have to frame university institutions for a Catholic people, and banish from your minds the baneful thought which has marred and destroyed so many of your best devised plans—the thought, it may be unacknowledged to your minds, but always present—that in framing your measures for Ireland you may do something to alter or to modify the convictions of the people.

May I venture to appeal to all parties in this House to do that which I have proved to be justice upon this question. There are many in this House who are pledged to support religious education in England. Will you deny it to Ireland? Tell me not of Protestant and Roman Catholic. You cannot give religious



education to the Irish Protestant and deny it to the Irish Catholic. I go further, I warn you you cannot long maintain a system of higher education for Protestants while you exclude Roman Catholics from a full share of its benefits; surely we have examples enough in the history of Ireland that all institutions that are based upon the exclusion of the mass of the people must fail. But I am speaking now of religious education. I am addressing myself to those who think with me that educational institutions ought to be based upon religion. Do you wish to see Ireland handed over to a system of state education from which the religious element shall be carefully excluded. Believe me you have no choice between this and a measure such as I propose. In denying religious education to the Catholic you involve the necessity of denying it to all Irishmen.

But may I not appeal to another party in the House, to the representatives of the advanced Liberal Party that are near me—a party to whom upon so many Irish questions we owe deep obligations. Why should you withdraw from us upon this? I know that your views and mine upon the subject of education are not alike. You are in favour of what is called secular education. I believe no education is complete that does not train the moral and religious, as well as the intellectual, nature of man. But it is not by our own views we ought to decide this question. The educational institutions you frame for the Irish people ought to be such as the Irish people choose. I appeal to you on your own principles of freedom, of respect for conscience. In forcing a secular education on a people or an individual, there may be a violation of conscience and of parental right as great and as violent as any that is committed in forcing on the child a religious teaching of which his parent does not approve. Pardon me for saying it, there may be a bigotry of secularism as well as of religion—and an intolerance in shutting out all religious teaching, as well as in forcing the teaching of one religion upon all. Who is to be the judge in this matter? Who is to determine whether the child is to be sent to a religious school or to one from which every religious element is to be excluded? Who is to judge as the

child grows up to the age of higher education, whether he is to receive a university teaching with which religion is to be interwoven, or one from which all distinctive religious teaching is to be excluded? Who, I ask you, is to be the judge, you or the father of the child? Do I ask for more than perfect toleration, for perfect freedom of conscience, when I ask you to allow the Irish Catholic parent to have the right to educate his child in the manner in which his religion and his conscience tell him it is his duty to educate him. He has not that right as long as you deprive him of a university education, and a university degree for his son, unless at the price of disobeying the dictates of his conscience, and surrendering the most cherished convictions of his heart.

It is to remedy this great injustice, to redress this great wrong, that I appeal to-night to all parties in this House. I thank you for the patience and attention with which you have listened to me so long. This university question is one upon which more almost than any other Irish question I feel deeply and earnestly. I have proved to you that on the great mass of the Irish nation your present arrangements inflict a mighty wrong. It is not only the denial of education—it is that you give to others that which you deny to them. You provide for the Protestant educational institutions and endowments for his teaching, to compete in the contests of life with the Roman Catholic, who has none of these advantages. As far as your legislation or your institution can do it, you establish a religious ascendancy of the worst kind—the ascendancy of mental culture and superior education. It is vain to say you have religious equality while you open to the adherents of one creed the advantages of that culture and that education, which you deny to those who profess the religion of the people. I look back to my own early life and I remember the educational facilities which were provided for me by endowments of the school to which lands and revenues were attached, sufficient to attract the highest teaching capacity in the land, and provide all the appliances that made that teaching effective, the university that in all that constituted mental culture rivalled the proudest uni-

versity in Christendom. Give the same advantages now to the Roman Catholic young man whose aspirations for knowledge and for education, and for intellectual distinction, beat as highly and as nobly as those of his Protestant companions. In the name of justice, throw aside every consideration except that of placing all Irishmen upon an equality in this great question without inflicting upon any man civil disability on account of his religious faith. Extend to the Catholic people of Ireland the boon for which they earnestly pray, the blessings of an education of which they can avail themselves, without compromising their religious convictions—an education which will remove from them the last mark of the inferiority to which your old policy condemned them—an education which will elevate them, not only among their own countrymen, but in the ranks of the nations of the world.



## APPENDIX A.

---

Report of the Interview between the Chancellor of the Exchequer and  
the Deputation of the City of Dublin, on the 9th of May.

The full report of the answer of the Chancellor of the Exchequer can scarcely be understood without the address of the members of the deputation, to which it was a reply.

---

From the *Freeman's Journal*, May 10th, 1877.

LONDON, WEDNESDAY.

This afternoon a deputation from the Dublin Corporation, consisting of the Right Hon. the Lord Mayor (Alderman Tarpey), Alderman P. P. M'Swiney, Alderman Harris, Alderman Fry, and Councillor Dawson, waited upon Sir Stafford Northcote, at his official residence in Downing Street, with reference to the question of University Education in Ireland. There were also present the following members of Parliament :—Mr. Butt, Mr. M'Carthy Downing, Mr. Brooks, The O'Connor Don, Lord F. Conyngham, Major O'Gorman, Sir Patrick O'Brien, Sir J. M'Kenna, Mr. P. Callan.

The deputation was introduced to the Chancellor of the Exchequer by

Mr. Butt, who said he had been requested to introduce the members of the Dublin Corporation who were present. The Lord Mayor had come over from Ireland to present a petition on the subject of University Education in Ireland, and being here it was thought it would be desirable to embrace the opportunity, and wait upon an influential member of the Ministry, and draw attention to the strength of the feeling in Ireland with regard to the question (hear, hear). The Lord Mayor had called upon Sir Stafford, who had been kind enough to fix the present time for the reception of the deputation. A telegram had been sent to Dublin, and four or five of the chief members had come over specially to be present. The High Sheriff would have come over had he not been prevented. The Right Hon. Gentleman would be aware that he (Mr. Butt) had introduced a bill dealing with this question. In support of the bill a large number of petitions had been presented, numbering nearly 100,000, the figures being at present, he thought,

93,000; and these represented a large number of people, although they were in many instances signed by one individual in his official capacity. The object of the present deputation was not so much to press any particular measure upon the Government as to impress upon them the fact that there was in Ireland an exceedingly strong feeling with regard to this question, and that there was a widespread feeling that the time had come when the matter should be dealt with by the Legislature (hear, hear). He might further mention that a larger and larger number of Protestants were coming over to this view of the question. The deputation was particularly anxious to impress upon the Chancellor of the Exchequer the importance of allowing the matter to be discussed in the House of Commons on an early day, otherwise great dissatisfaction would be caused. He would now introduce the Lord Mayor of Dublin (hear, hear).

The Lord Mayor said, that as the leader of the House of Commons, the Irish people had great confidence in Sir Stafford Northcote's judgment and impartiality, and they considered his knowledge of public affairs, and long experience as a statesman, a guarantee that the important subject which had brought the deputation there would not be lost sight of (hear, hear). If the measure introduced by Mr. Butt, or any similar one, were passed by the Government, it would be most acceptable. He was justified in saying that nine-tenths of the people of Ireland were anxious for it, and it would only be a simple act of justice to let them have it. The Catholics of Ireland wished only for what was their right (hear, hear). The Lord Mayor added that he would not delay the Right Hon. Gentleman, but merely say that the Irish people hoped he would make every effort to carry the question to a satisfactory issue, and they trusted confidently, when they regarded the Chancellor's past career, that this would be done. The Right Hon. Gentleman had doubtless seen a copy of the petition (the petition was handed to Sir Stafford). This had been presented to the House. He would beg to introduce Mr. Alderman M'Swiney.

Alderman M'Swiney said the subject which the Lord Mayor had introduced to the notice of the Chancellor of the Exchequer occupied the attention of four-fifths of the people in the cities and rural districts of Ireland. The position which he had the honour to hold in connection with the Irish University movement enabled him to state that it was the question of the present hour in Ireland. There had been numerous previous deputations on the subject. Among others was that from the municipality of Dublin to Lord Beaconsfield, then Mr. Disraeli. Mr. Gladstone also had received very influential communications from Ireland, and had made an attempt, though unsuccessful, to settle the question. The people of Ireland believed that a Government which had done so much for the religious convictions of England would not neglect the demand now made upon them in behalf of Ireland for the settlement of this question. The large number of signatures to the petitions had been referred to by Mr. Butt, and this had been preceded by a great number of petitions in 1868, when the ques-

tion of education formed one of the leading questions then agitating the country. He believed that at least a quarter of a million of signatures were appended to the petitions which poured into the House of Commons, and from that time to this the question had been more or less pressed upon successive Governments. Yet the question had not been successfully dealt with. In coming there from the Corporation of Dublin their chief object was to press on the leader of the House of Commons the intense feeling of the people of Ireland on the subject. He did not think it would be going too far to say that it was, from the Irish point of view, the most pressing of all subjects. Young men were being sent out every day upon their careers under great disadvantages, in consequence of the present constitution of the Universities of Ireland. The majority of the people had conscientious scruples against their sons attending these. They wished to transmit their faith to their posterity without any dilution or depreciation whatever. They believed that the time had come when the subject ought to be dealt with, and it would be becoming on the part of the Government of the day—a Government which had done so much for the cause of religion in England—to take into consideration the feelings and wants of the Irish people on this question. They had come there to impress upon the Right Hon. Gentleman its importance, and they hoped and trusted that the Government would set apart a day before long to admit of the question being discussed in Parliament, and have the opinion of the country taken upon it. He felt certain it was not too much to say that by giving due consideration to the wants and wishes of the Irish people there would be a response—a hearty response—given by the people (hear, hear). The Government which attended to their wants would find that their appreciation would not be wanting (hear, hear).

Alderman Fry said that as he had the honour of seconding the resolution in their Council Chamber in Dublin, he would take the opportunity of saying a few words from a Protestant point of view. The members of the Council present, in their individual opinion, represented the several various forms of political and religious faith held by the citizens of Dublin. He had considerable knowledge of the views entertained by the people, and he would say that he was not aware of any question which had been agitated, which had been considered of so much importance as this question, not only by the clergy, but also by laymen. The day the question was under consideration in Dublin they had had one of the largest meetings he remembered, and the feeling was almost unanimously in favour of the petition presented by the Lord Mayor. It was true that many Protestants might differ in opinion as to matters of detail. He thought they were all, however, prepared to make concessions—it might be from their point of view to the prejudices of the Catholics—which would meet their views. They did not, he thought, propose anything calculated to injure the Protestant cause. The Catholics wanted, and the Protestants were anxious that they should have the same.

privileges as they (the Protestants) enjoyed. He and the other members of the deputation only asked, in fact, that the promise of religious equality to all, which had been flaunted so frequently, should become an accomplished fact. Irishmen in general were anxious to see this vexed question settled once for all, and so bring about those cordial and kindly feelings which all were so anxious should exist.

Mr. Councillor Dawson said it was scarcely necessary, after what Sir Stafford had heard from the other members of the deputation, and from the Chancellor of the Exchequer's own knowledge of the question, for him to enter into the subject. It was, however, quite clear there was a necessity for a change in the present system, and, as a citizen of Limerick, and having held the office of High Sheriff last year, he had had opportunities of observing that the question was considered of the highest importance by the people of Ireland. The number who attended Trinity College was lamentably small, and the number who entered for the art classes alone in the Queen's Colleges was ridiculous, and there could be no doubt but that these institutions had failed to effect the purpose for which they were established. He referred to the advantages which had accrued to other countries—notably Italy, France, and Germany—through the extension of their university systems, and pointed out that any falling off in this respect was followed or attended by a decline in learning and culture, and argued therefrom the urgent necessity for provision being made for the large number of young Irishmen who were at present precluded from the privilege of a university education, and concluded by saying that the Government would confer a great blessing on the people of Ireland if they would pass a measure such as that which had been introduced by Mr. Butt (hear, hear).

Alderman Harris said that, without entering into any discussion upon the merits of Mr. Butt's bill, having supported in the Dublin Corporation the movement to grant a charter for a Catholic College in Ireland, he considered it his duty, as he happened to be in London, to attend the deputation. He was in favour of granting to his Catholic fellow-countrymen a measure of education to the fullest extent they might, through their representatives, demand, but he would not support or advocate any measure which would interfere with the endowment, efficiency, and liberality of Trinity College, Dublin, within whose walls some of his co-religionists were at present receiving their education, and many had graduated with honour to themselves, and he felt a deep debt of gratitude for the liberality of feeling which had always been manifested towards them by the governing body (hear, hear).

The Chancellor of the Exchequer, in reply, said—I had not expected to have the pleasure of receiving so influential and important a deputation. If I had I would have asked my right hon. friend, Sir Michael Hicks Beach, to be here, as he has, and naturally so, paid more attention to the subject than any other member of the Government. I may say, however, that I



fully recognise the very great importance of the question you have brought before me, and I entirely recognise the very great claims Mr. Butt has to consideration in bringing such a measure before Parliament, and his right to obtain a fair and full discussion. Mr. Butt not only has those claims which a distinguished member of Parliament possesses, but he has strong academical claims, and I am quite sure that in his hands any measure of this sort would receive the best and most careful treatment. You know as well as I do what underlying fires there are in connection with such a question as that of University Education in Ireland, and I think you will excuse me if I do not plunge into the question further than to say that I have all along considered this a question which ought to be dealt with, and that the statements which have been laid before me by this deputation confirm me in my opinion (applause). I am quite prepared to bring the matter before my colleagues, with a view to obtain a day for the purpose of having the Irish University question discussed in the House of Commons, as you wish (applause). I ought not, however, to conceal from you that in the condition of business in the House of Commons, I am afraid there will be some difficulty in the matter. There is business we must attend to, and how much time it may occupy I cannot say. The position Mr. Butt's bill has on the paper is not a very favourable one, I believe. It is, in fact, I think, down for to-day, and we may judge from his presence here now, that there is very little prospect of it being reached (laughter). This is not a question to be settled offhand. It is in good hands (hear, hear). We should be prepared to consider carefully anything coming from such a member as the Irish University Bill does (applause).

The deputation then withdrew.



# APPENDIX B.

## DIVISION ON THE SECOND READING.

The following Analysis of the Irish Vote is taken from Mr. McAlister's Parliamentary Green Book of last session.

Irish Vote—Ayes, 54. Noes, 14. Absent, 34.

### AYES.

*Home Rulers.*  
 Biggar, Joseph Gillis  
 Blennerhassett, Rowland P.  
 Bowyer, Sir George  
 Brooks, Maurice  
 Browne, George Ekins  
 Bryan, George Leopold  
 Butt, Isaac  
 Callan, Philip  
 Collins, Eugene  
 Conyngham, Lord Francis  
 Dease, Edmund Gerald  
 Delahunty, James  
 Downing, McCarthy  
 Dunbar, John  
 Ennis, Nicholas  
 Errington, George  
 Fay, Charles Joseph  
 Gray, Edmund Dwyer

Henry, Mitchell  
 King-Harman, E. R.  
 Kirk, George Harley  
 Lewis, H. Owen (Carlow)  
 McKenna, Sir Joseph Neal  
 Martin, Patrick  
 Meldon, Charles Henry  
 Montagu, Rt. Hon. Lord R.  
 Moore, Arthur J. (Clonmel)  
 Morris, George  
 Murphy, Nicholas Daniel  
 Nolan, Captain John P.  
 O'Beirne, Captain Francis  
 O'Brien, Sir Patrick  
 O'Byrne, William Richard  
 O'Clery, Keyes  
 O'Connor, D. M. (Sligo Co.)  
 O'Connor Don, The (Roscmn.)  
 O'Donnell, Francis H.

O'Gorman, Purcell  
 O'Reilly, Myles William  
 O'Shaughnessy, Richard  
 Parnell, Charles Stewart  
 Power, J. O'Connor (Mayo)  
 Power, Richard (Waterford)  
 Redmond, William Archer  
 Sheil, Edward  
 Sherlock, Serjeant David  
 Smyth, Patrick J. (W. meath)  
 Stacpoole, William  
 Sullivan, Alexander M.  
 Ward, Michael Francis

### *Liberals.*

Cogan, Rt. Hon. W. H. F.  
 O'Donoghue, The  
 Swanston, Alexander  
 Whitworth, Ben. (Kilkenny)

### NOES.

*Conservatives.*  
 Beresford, G. D. la P. (Arm)  
 Close, Maxwell Charles  
 Corry, Hn. H. W. L. (Tyrone)  
 Crichton, Viscount  
 Gibson, Rt. Hon. Edward

Guinness, Sir Arthur E.  
 Hamilton, Ion T. (Dub. Co.)  
 Leslie, Sir John  
 Lewis, Chas. Edwd. (Derry)  
 Macartney, J. W. Ellison  
 Plunket, Hon. David R.

Taylor, Rt. Hn. Col. (Dub. Co.)  
 Verner, Edward Wingfield

### *Liberal.*

Smyth, Richard (Derry Co.)

### ABSENT.

*Home Rulers.*  
 Brady, John  
 Digby, Kenelm Thomas  
 French, Hon. Charles  
 MacCarthy, John George  
 O'Leary, William H.  
 O'Sullivan, William Henry  
 Shaw, William  
 Synan, Edmund John

Bruen, Henry  
 Chainé, James  
 Cole, Col. Hon. Henry A.  
 Corry, Jas. Porter (Belfast)  
 Damer, Captain Dawson  
 Dick, W. W. Fitzwilliam  
 Goulding, William  
 Hamilton, Marq. of (Donegal)  
 Johnson, William  
 Kavanagh, Arthur MacM.  
 Moore, Stephen (Tipperary)  
 Mullhollaund, John  
 O'Neill, Hon. Edward

Shirley, Sewallis Evelyn  
 Trevor, Lord A. E. Hill-  
 Wallace, Sir Richard  
 Wilson, William

### *Liberals.*

Crawford, James Sharman  
 Dalway, Marriott Robert  
 Dickson, Thomas Alexander  
 Herbert, Henry Arthur  
 Law, Rt. Hon. Hugh  
 Taylor, Daniel (Coleraine)  
 Whitworth William (Newry)

*Conservatives.*  
 Archdale, Wm. Humphreys  
 Beresford, Ld. C. (Watfd. Co)

## APPENDIX C.

---

The following is the paper submitted to the Chancellor of the Exchequer in the month of May, requesting that an early day might be fixed for the consideration of the bill :—

We, the undersigned members of the House of Commons, representing Irish constituencies, feel it our duty to ask the attention of Ministers—especially of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, as the leader of the House of Commons, to the bill introduced during the present session on the subject of Irish University Education.

We have every reason to believe that the settlement proposed by that bill will meet with acceptance from the heads of the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland, and give satisfaction to the whole Roman Catholic people.

Under such circumstances, it is of great importance that this measure should receive an early and a full discussion.

It is impossible for it to do so unless facilities for that discussion are given by the Government.

In view of the importance of the question, the new position in which it now comes before Parliament, and the deep interest taken in it by the people of Ireland, we feel justified in pressing on her Majesty's Ministers the request that they will assent to the fixing of a day for the second reading of the bill, so as to afford an opportunity for full discussion of a question which statesmen of all parties admit to be of vital importance.

|                          |               |
|--------------------------|---------------|
| O'Connor Don,            | Co. Roscommon |
| Isaac Butt,              | Limerick      |
| Mitchell Henry,          | Co. Galway    |
| A. M. Sullivan,          | Co. Louth     |
| John George MacCarthy    | Mallow        |
| Cn. M. O'Loughlen Bart., | Co. Clare     |
| W. H. F. Cogan,          | Co. Kildare   |
| Robert Montagu,          | Co. Westmeath |

|                           |               |
|---------------------------|---------------|
| Charles Beresford,        | Co. Waterford |
| Francis Conyngham,        | Clare Co      |
| McCarthy Downing          | Co. Cork      |
| Richard O'Shaughnessy,    | Limerick      |
| Patrick O'Brien, Bart.,   | King's Co     |
| David Sherlock, serjeant, |               |
|                           | King's Co.    |
| O'Donoghue,               | Tralee        |

|                       |               |                     |               |
|-----------------------|---------------|---------------------|---------------|
| George Bowyer, Bart,  | Wexford Co    | Richard Power,      | Waterford     |
| George Bryan          | Kilkenny Co   | Arthur Moore,       | Clonmel       |
| E. R. King-Harman,    | Co. Sligo     | John Brady,         | Leitrim       |
| Keyes O'Clery,        | Wexford Co    | J. O'Connor Power,  | [Mayo Co.     |
| J. P. Nolan,          | Galway Co     | Wm. H. O'Sullivan,  | Limerick Co.  |
| J. N. M'Kenna,        | Youghal       | E. J. Synan,        | Limerick Co.  |
| Maurice Brooks,       | City Dublin   | M. F. Ward,         | Galway        |
| Henry A. Herbert,     | Kerry         | Purcell O'Gorman,   | Waterford     |
| Philip Callan         | Dundalk       | Wm. Stacpoole.      | Ennis         |
| F. O'Beirne,          | Co. Leitrim   | J. O'Keeffe,        | Dungarvan     |
| John Dunbar           | New Ross      | N. Ennis,           | Meath Co.     |
| James Delahunty,      | Co. Waterford | W. H. O'Leary,      | Drogheda      |
| Geo. H. Kirk,         | Co. Louth     | Alexander Swanston, | Bandon        |
| Joseph G. Bigger,     | Co. Cavan     | N. D. Murphy,       | Cork          |
| Chas. S. Parnell,     | Co. Meath     | Charles French,     | Roscommon Co. |
| Wm. R. O'Byrne,       | Co. Wicklow   | Denis M. O'Conor,   | Sligo Co.     |
| Edward Sheil,         | Athlone       | George Errington,   | Longford      |
| Eugene Collins,       | Kinsale       | George Morris,      | Galway        |
| Owen Lewis,           | Carlow        | Charles H. Meldon,  | Kildare       |
| George Browne,        | Co. Mayo      | Thomas A. Dickson,  | Dungannon     |
| R. P. Blennerhassett, | Kerry         | Benjamin Whitworth, | Kilkenny      |
| Chas. J. Fay,         | Co. Cavan     | Edmund Dease,       | Queen's Co.   |
| W. A. Redmond,        | Wexford       | Wm. Whitworth,      | Newry         |





3 0112 061619364

## APPENDIX D.

## TRINITY COLLEGE, DUBLIN.

RETURN to an Order of the Honourable The House of Commons,  
dated 31st July, 1877;—for,

- “ RETURNS of the Number of ROMAN CATHOLIC STUDENTS having their Names on the Books of TRINITY COLLEGE, *Dublin*, at the present time : ”  
 “ Of the Number of such STUDENTS having ROOMS within the COLLEGE : ”  
 “ Of the Number of ROMAN CATHOLICS who have been Admitted to SCHOLARSHIP in the COLLEGE in each Year since, and including the Year 1873 : ”  
 “ Of the Number of ROMAN CATHOLIC STUDENTS who have entered TRINITY COLLEGE in each of the last Ten Years : ”  
 “ And of the Number of ROMAN CATHOLICS who have taken the Degree of BACHELOR of Arts in each of the last Ten Years . ”

—:O:—

## TRINITY COLLEGE, DUBLIN.

NUMBER of Roman Catholic Students having their Names on the Books of Trinity College, *Dublin*, at the present time :

75.

NUMBER of such Students having Rooms within the College :

12.

NUMBER of Roman Catholics who have been Admitted to Scholarship in the College in each Year, and including the Year 1873 :

|      |     |     |     |     |     |   |
|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|---|
| 1873 | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | 2 |
| 1874 | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | 1 |
| 1875 | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | 0 |
| 1876 | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | 1 |
| 1877 | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | 0 |

TOTAL ... .. 4

NUMBER of Roman Catholic Students who have entered Trinity College in each Year of the last Ten Years :

|      |     |     |    |      |     |    |
|------|-----|-----|----|------|-----|----|
| 1867 | ... | ... | 20 | 1872 | ... | 27 |
| 1868 | ... | ... | 22 | 1873 | ... | 34 |
| 1869 | ... | ... | 25 | 1874 | ... | 27 |
| 1870 | ... | ... | 35 | 1875 | ... | 20 |
| 1871 | ... | ... | 23 | 1876 | ... | 36 |

TOTAL ... .. 269

NUMBER of Roman Catholics who have taken the Degree of Bachelor of Arts in each of the last Ten Years :

|      |     |     |    |      |     |    |
|------|-----|-----|----|------|-----|----|
| 1867 | ... | ... | 7  | 1872 | ... | 11 |
| 1868 | ... | ... | 7  | 1873 | ... | 14 |
| 1869 | ... | ... | 13 | 1874 | ... | 18 |
| 1870 | ... | ... | 4  | 1875 | ... | 10 |
| 1871 | ... | ... | 10 | 1876 | ... | 11 |

TOTAL ... .. 105

(Signed)

Trinity College, Dublin.  
11th August, 1877.

THOMAS STACK,  
Registrar of Trinity College, and of  
The University of Dublin.